



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Time Clock Need Not Be Punched.—Plaintiff brought an action against defendant to recover the sum of \$2.10 for one day's work at 20 cents an hour earned as a frame builder, for which payment had been refused. *Matthews v. Industrial Lumber Company*, 75 South-eastern Reporter, 170. Defendant admitted that plaintiff had performed the work, but refused to pay him because he had failed to punch on that day a mechanical time clock as all employees were required to do when going on and off duty. The Supreme Court of South Carolina holds that plaintiff was not bound by any rule that he had not contracted to observe or was not incident to or assumed by him in the general scope of his employment, even though he had knowledge of it and violated it. Having performed the work required, he was entitled to be paid.

Admissibility of Evidence as to Character.—While the law says that when a defendant is placed upon trial under a criminal charge he may offer evidence as to his good character, can he go a step further and show that his character is better than that of the average man? The question is answered by the Court of Appeal of Alabama in *Cook v. State*, 59 Southern Reporter, 519, in a case in which defendant, a negro, was charged with homicide. The court says: "We know of no rule, however, which permits a defendant to show by witnesses that he—after the similitude of the Pharisee who was thankful that he was better than other men—possesses a character superior in points of excellence to that of the average man. The witness Harris was properly permitted to testify that the defendant was, in the community in which he lived, regarded as a man of good character. The court properly refused, however, to allow that witness to testify that his character was better than 'the average negro.' The law draws no distinction between the negro and the members of the white race as to what is or is not a good character. There is but one standard, and all men must measure up to it."

An Unmarried Woman Determined.—Who is an unmarried woman? This is the pivotal question in *People v. Weinstock*, 140 New York Supplement, 453, a seduction case, in which under the statute defining the crime it devolved upon the state to show that prosecutrix was unmarried. The facts are: The prosecutrix was married in 1901 in New York, where she lived with her husband for a period of one year. Soon thereafter he deserted her, and ever since his whereabouts have been unknown. She has never heard from him or about him and does not now know whether he be living or dead, but she testified that she had heard he went away with another woman. In 1911 she charged defendant in the above action with seduction under the Penal Law protecting "unmarried" women, etc. The city magistrate's court of New York City holds that an